THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY TRINITY.

The following letter has been addressed to the editor of the *Hull Packet*:—

"Sir,—As a lover of ecclesiastical architecture, it was with feelings of regret that I saw mentioned in your columns the present dilapidated state of the church of the Holy Trinity, Hull.

"Nothing, surely, can be a greater sign of the religious degeneracy of our times, than the almost universal neglect into which our churches had fallen previous to the great movement which has of late been made in favour of Christian architecture. Those glorious structures (beautifully styled by Coleridge "Petrefactions of our religion") which, in their faded magnificence, bear testimony to the faithfulness of former generations, in raising temples worthy the honour of the High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity, exclaim no less eloquently, through the decay into which they have wilfully been permitted to fall, against the faithlessness of this degenerate age.

"It is, therefore, with feelings of no common interest that I would congratulate the inhabitants of Hull on the noble efforts they are making towards the restoration of the church of the Holy Trinity (knowing; as I do, the architectural merit it possesses) to its pristine beauty. But, at the same time, I would wish to remind them that, although the flame of church-building zeal—but lately so nearly extinguished—has in some measure been rekindled, there is, it is to be much regretted, much of zeal without knowledge abroad among us. Without wishing to dispute the talent and ability of the architects they have selected, I would merely suggest the advantage of subjecting their plan for the approval of one of the architectural societies, either the Yorkshire or Cambridge Camden Society. Thus acting upon the principle that 'in the multitude of counsellors there is safety,' they would be sure of procuring the best advice this age could afford them in the restoration of their church; at the same time ensuring that sacramentality of design which is the distinguishing mark of true Christian architecture.

The design of Messrs. Lockwood and Allom, which I saw in this year's exhibition at the Royal Academy, appeared to me highly commendable; but I cannot conceive, whoever the chosen architect may be, that he could fairly scruple to offer his plan for the criticisms of an architectural society. Wishing the good people of Hull success in their pious undertaking, and thanking you for the space I have occupied in your columns,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
AN ECCLESIOLOGIST.

London, Dec. 19, 1843.

CHANGE OF VALUE IN AGRICULTURAL AND MANUFACTURING PRODUCE.—A quantity of agricultural produce which, in 1694 was worth £100, would, at the present price, be worth £243; while a quantity of manufactured goods, which, in 1694, was worth £100, would now only be worth £40—so that a quantity of agricultural produce which, in 1694, would have exchanged for £100 value of manufactures, would, at the present relative value, command the same quantity that would, at that period, have sold for £600. Or, a quantity of manufactures which, in 1694, would have exchanged for £100 value of agricultural produce, would, at the present relative value, command only the quantity which would then have been worth £16. 9s. 2d. It may be curious and interesting to examine a few of the articles separately.

Butter and cheese have risen in price during the period 193 per cent.
Corn, flour, &c., have risen 161 per cent.
Cows have risen in price 209 per cent.
Horses have risen in price 267 per cent.
Wool has risen in price 169 per cent.
While cotton manufactures have fallen in price during that period 73 per cent.
Coals have fallen in price 60 per cent.
Iron and steel have fallen in price 45 per cent.
Linen manufactures have fallen in price 36 per cent.

And, what is very curious, while wool has risen 169 per cent., woollen manufactures have fallen 10 per cent. in price. It must be remarked that these calculations are in no way disturbed by any changes in the value of money during the interval; for, whatever change in this respect has taken place, refers as much to one class of articles as to the other. The comparison is equally true, whatever changes have taken place in the value of our currency.

Correspondence.

"To whatever extent the physical strength and probable duration of the working man's life are diminished by noxious agencies, to the same extent so much productive power is lost; and in the case of destitute widowhood and orphanage, burdens are created, and cast either on the industrious survivors belonging to the family, or on the contributors to the poor's rates, during the whole period of the failure of such ability."—*Mr. Chadwick, in Gen. Law Rept.*

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BUILDER.

Sir,—Although the doctrine of the Poor Law Commissioners is not always to be received as gospel, I think no one can dispute the truth of the above remark, and as it appears to bear upon a subject I have long wished to see brought prominently before the public, and which is noticed in p. 513 of THE BUILDER (viz. Public Baths), I have thought proper to prefix it to these remarks, hoping that you will persevere in impressing upon the minds of "our pastors and masters" the necessity for such establishments until public baths are to be found throughout the length and breadth of the land.

In your article on Public Baths, I see that the working men of Edinburgh and of the metropolis are seeking to provide baths, but upon what principle is not stated. It seems therefore in this respect, as in most others, the working bees, alias the great multitude, are to be the pioneers in all that tends to improve the condition of the human race. From the present state of things one would almost imagine cleanliness and healthfulness to be a crime in all except those of patrician blood. The unwashed may certainly walk soberly and steadily in fresh health-giving fields and breathe the pure air provided alike for rich and poor (that is, if he can find time to do so, and then he must beware of trespassing and have the fear of the law before his eyes); he must be very careful not to refresh his dust-begrimed and toil-worn limbs in a bath prepared for him and to which he is invited by nature, for he has been most probably forewarned by a large board painted in staring characters that "all persons fishing or bathing in this water will be prosecuted as the law directs." Now, Sir, it appears to me that if the laws and decencies of civilized life, ownership of the soil, &c. forbid the free use of these blessings provided by a God of Love for all his creatures, that they ought surely to provide an equivalent for the benefits of which they deprive them. This, I conceive, society fails of doing so long as any and every man has not an opportunity of effecting something more towards cleanliness and healthfulness (which are nearly allied) than by mere fare-washing perhaps once a week, which I am sorry to see is the case too frequently in our manufacturing towns; and even in those towns where swimming-baths are provided, they are in the hands of private speculators, who of course require payment from all those who may be disposed to bathe, such sum being much more than a large majority of people can afford to pay oftener than once a week. People who can only avail themselves of the bath once a week, soon learn to do without it altogether.

Now it either is or is not the duty of a government to be watchful as to every thing that may tend to the benefit or injury of those placed under its charge. That it is the duty of our rulers thus "to be found watching," cannot, I think, be denied, and if the truth of Mr. Chadwick's remarks be admitted, I beg to submit that the question of public baths and gymnasia is one which ought to engage the most serious attention of those placed in authority over us. What, I would ask (in connection with proper bathing places), can be better calculated to raise up

"A bold peasantry, their country's pride,"

than the setting apart of a few acres of land as gymnasia, not only in every large town, where there should be several, but in every village? here all kinds of athletic games should be encouraged, and prizes might be given occasionally as at our agricultural meetings. The nations of old appear in their most high and palmy days to have been aware of the great advantages and happiness which a healthy high-spirited nation, not enervated by luxury, so derives. It was in the gymnasia of the Greeks when *Greece was Greece*, that the young were instructed in the arts of peace and war, and in all accomplishments calculated to make them useful citizens, and we are told that "as long as they were protected by the state, the sciences and the arts were cultivated with great zeal." The baths of Diocletian, Titus, Agrippa, Nero, Domitian, and others, bear testimony as to the great care taken by the ancient Romans to provide both for the minds and body of even the *populace*. They are described as having stood among extensive gardens and walks containing large halls for swimming and bathing, some for conversation, others for various athletic and manly [illegible] lectures of philosophers, &c., and for every species of polite and manly amusement. The Thermæ were, at an immense expense, constructed chiefly for the use of the plebeian class. "For, supposing each cell of Diocletian's baths large enough to contain six people, yet even at that moderate computation 18,000 persons might be bathing at the same time."

Even the savage tribes of America, as we are informed by Messrs Lewis and Clarke, make use of the vapour-bath, which they greatly esteem for all kinds of disease. Where must the labouring poor in England go for a vapour-bath? Now, Sir, it appears to me that the great mass of the people should not only have opportunities of healthful exercise, but should also be induced to make use of them. In order to this, might not every town containing above a certain number of inhabitants, say 5,000, be compelled to provide bathing accommodation for a certain proportion of its population free of charge? In connection with which there might be private baths, for which remuneration might be required; these, as bathing became general, would probably pay the expenses required in keeping up the public swimming-baths. Many different modes of carrying out the principle might be suggested, and trusting that some of your correspondents, who are much more capable than myself of doing so, will take up the subject.—Yours, Leamington, December 23, 1843. NORMAN.

LONDON, ITS SIZE AND POPULATION.

Sir,—Perhaps there is no way of really giving the mind a full comprehension of the size of any place better than the comparing such a place with others well known.

Most persons are acquainted with some of the following towns and cities, viz., Lincoln, Warwick, Dover, Boston, Winchester, Salisbury, Colchester, Yarmouth, Durham, Gloucester, Ipswich, Stafford, Hereford, Rochester, Doncaster, Carlisle, Canterbury, Wakefield, Hertford, Bedford, Bridgwater, Chesterfield, Darlington, Cirencester, Bury St. Edmunds, Devizes, Dartmouth, Beverley, and Grantham. Now we all know what a vast overgrown town is Manchester, but perhaps few would suppose that the whole of the population of the above cities and towns would be required to make another Manchester. If to the foregoing places, the last excepted, be added Gainsborough, Peterborough, Dartford, Huntingdon, Shaftsbury, Ely, Stamford, and Lichfield, so gigantic has been the stride which the metropolis has made between the years 1831 and 1841, that a population equal to the thirty-seven towns named above has been joined to it within that short period, during which time London has increased nearly 400,000. If this calculation be extended, by adding to these thirty-seven towns the following great and important places, viz. Liverpool, Bristol, Birmingham, Nottingham, Newcastle, Brighton, Bath, Leicester, Cambridge, Chester, Halifax, Derby, Huddersfield, Norwich, Northampton, York, Exeter, Lancaster, Worcester, Ramsgate, Plymouth, Scarborough, Taunton, Leamington, Newark, Mansfield, Whitby, Kidderminster, Sheffield, Tunbridge, Leeds, and Shrewsbury, making altogether sixty-nine of the principle cities and towns of England; yet so immense, so almost inconceivable is the population of the metropolis, that the whole of these places joined together would not make another London, for these sixty-nine towns make 1,873,189, when added together, whilst the metropolis alone is 1,873,676, leaving an overplus of 487 souls in favour of London. It would also require 534 towns as large as Huntingdon to make another metropolis.

So rapid is the growth of this queen of cities, that a population equal to that of Salisbury is added to the numbers every three months, but so overwhelmingly large is this Leviathan of towns, that this constant and progressive increase (astounding as the fact may appear) is scarcely perceived, for it is almost like throwing a bucket of water into the ocean. Such is London—the city of the world.

N.B.—These calculations are based upon the last census. J. R. W.

16, Norton-street, 1st Jan. 1844.

SWISS COTTAGES BY NORMAN.

Sir,—Your correspondent, "Norman," very justly calls the attention of your readers in general to the design for a Swiss cottage, given in page 471 of THE BUILDER, from the pencil of "P. T." After quoting from an article in the *Architectural Magazine* on the subject of Swiss cottages by Karle Phusin, and comparing the description therein given with the design of "P. T." and making a few remarks on the discrepancy of the two authorities; he concludes by expressing a hope that some of your readers, who have had opportunities of judging of the comparative correctness of Karle Phusin's description and of "P. T.'s" design, will favour him by giving judgment in the case.

[illegible]